

Canons of the Second Ecumenical Council

Prolegomena

The holy and ecumenical Second Council was held during the reign of Theodosius the Great, A.D. 381, and is also referred to as the First Ecumenical Council in Constantinople. Of the Fathers attending it the most notable were Nectarius the bishop of Constantinople, Timothy the bishop of Alexandria, Meletius the bishop of Antioch, Cyril the bishop of Jerusalem, Gregory the Theologian and Gregory of Nyssa; and many other bishops from the East made up a total number of 150. Not even one bishop from the West attended it; nor did Pope Damasus in person or by a legate, nor does even a conciliar letter of his appear therein.[38] Later, however, they agreed and acceded to the things it decreed, including Damasus and the whole Western Church, and even to this day they accept and recognize this Council as a truly ecumenical council. It was held primarily against Macedonius, who was blasphemously declaring that the Holy Spirit was a thing constructed or created by the Son, secondarily against Apollinaris, and against the Eunomians, including the Eudoxians and the Sabellians, and against the Marcellians, and against the Photinians,[39] and in general anathematized every heresy that had risen during the reign of Constantius, of Julian, and of Valens, emperors preceding it. After correcting the glorification and adoration of the Holy Trinity which had been altered by the Arians,[40] it renewed the doctrine of the Nicene Council, on the ground of its being thoroughly Orthodox in all respects. Hence, in order to let it appear that it professed the same beliefs as the Council held in Nicaea, it did not draw up a creed of its own, but, by simply making a small change in the Creed adopted by the Nicene Council, and adding the clause “of whose kingdom there shall be no end,” on account of the heresy of Apollinaris the millenarian,[41] and by developing the meaning of Article 8 in reference to the Holy Spirit, and also by supplying what was missing in the remaining four articles to the end,[42] it made identically the same as that which is now read by all Orthodox Christians, as it is seen in this Second Council (p. 286 of vol. i of the collection of the Councils) and in the fifth act of the same council (p. 155 of the same volume). Nevertheless, although this Second Council did make these additions to and changes in the Creed adopted by the First Council held in Nicaea, yet the Councils held thereafter accepted the Creed of the First and Second Councils as a single Creed. As to why this Council made these additions, see the Footnote to c. VII of the Third. In addition to all these things, it also adopted and promulgated the present seven Canons pertaining to the organization and discipline of the Church, indefinitely confirmed by c. I of the 4th, but definitely by c. II of the 6th and by c. I of the 7th. (See Dositheus, p. 222 of the Dodecabilus).[43]

1

The holy Fathers assembled in Constantinople have decided not to set aside the faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers who met in Nicaea, Bithynia, but to let it remain sovereign, and that every heresy be anathematized, and especially and specifically that of the Eunomians, including that of the Eudoxians, and that of the Semi-Arians, including that of the Pneumatomachs, and that of the Sabellians, and that of the Marcellians, and that of the Photinians, and that of the Apollinarians.

(c. V of the 2nd; cc. I and V of the 6th; c. II of Car.)

Interpretation

This first Canon of the present Council asserts that the 150 Holy Fathers who convened in Constantinople decided that the Orthodox faith, meaning the creed adopted by the 318 Fathers who had convened in Nicaea, Bithynia, should remain solid and inviolable, and that every heresy should be anathematized. In particular, the heresy of the Eunomians,[44] or of those called Eudoxians, the heresy of the Semi-Arians,[45] or of those known as Pneumatomachs (i.e., spirit-fighters), the heresy of the followers of Sabellius,[46] the heresy of the adherents of Marcellus,[47] the heresy of the pupils of Photinus,[48] and the heresy of those of Apollinaris.[49]

2

Bishops must not leave their own diocese and go over to churches beyond its boundaries; but, on the contrary, in accordance with the Canons, let the Bishop of Alexandria administer the affairs of Egypt only, let the Bishops of the East govern the Eastern Church only, the priorities granted to the church of the Antiochians in the Nicene Canons being kept inviolate, and let the Bishops of the Asian diocese (or administrative domain) administer only the affairs of the Asian church, and let those of the Pontic diocese look after the affairs of the diocese of Pontus only, and let those of the Thracian diocese manage the affairs of the Thracian diocese only. Let Bishops not go beyond their own province to carry out an ordination or any other ecclesiastical services unless (officially) summoned thither. When the Canon prescribed in regard to dioceses (or administrative provinces) is duly kept, it is evident that the synod of each province will confine itself to the affairs of that

particular province, in accordance with the regulations decreed in Nicaea. But the churches of God that are situated in territories belonging to barbarian nations must be administered in accordance with the customary practice of the Fathers.

(Ap. cc. XXXIV, XXXV; cc. VI, VII of the 1st; c. VIII of the 3rd; c. XXVIII of the 4th; cc. XX, XXX, XXXIX of the 6th; c. IX of Antioch; cc. III, XI, and XII of Sardica.)

Interpretation

Since, as is attested by Socrates (Book 5, ch. 8), officiation beyond the boundaries of one's own diocese was formerly a matter of indifference on account of persecutions, and, as Theodoret says, blessed Eusebius of Samosata did it as a matter of extraordinary zeal. On this account, when peace reappeared in the Church as a whole, the present Canon was adopted and promulgated. It relates neither to autocephalous Metropolitans alone, as Balsamon interpreted it, nor to Patriarchs alone,[50] but to both these classes of dignitaries alike, according to Dositheus (p. 233 of "Those who have served as Patriarchs"), in order that each of them may serve his own province and diocese, and not interfere in one that is alien, and not confound the rights of the churches; but, on the contrary, in accordance with the Canons (cc. VI and VII, that is to say of the First, and much more in accordance with Ap. cc. XXXIV and XXXV), that the bishop of Alexandria may manage only the parishes in Egypt (the Council expressly mentioned the bishop of Alexandria because the Bishop of Alexandria with his party cooperated to have Maximus the Cynic ordained in Constantinople, while, on the other hand, great St. Gregory was ousted from office in spite of its being his diocese and parish). The metropolitans of the East are to attend to the affairs of the East, with the proviso that the prerogatives of the bishop of Antioch be duly respected, in accordance with the Canon (sc. VI) of the Nicene Council; and the metropolitans of the Asian, Pontic and Thracian domains are to manage only the provinces belonging to them (these dignitaries, according to c. XXVIII of the 4th, have to be ordained after the bishop of Constantinople). It commands, in addition, that both patriarchs and metropolitans alike refrain from interloping beyond their own dioceses and provinces with the object of ordaining others or performing other ecclesiastical services in the parishes of others, without being invited to do so; and that the synod of each particular province shall manage the ecclesiastical matters of each province of the metropolitans, whether they be elections, or ordinations, or penances, or absolutions, or any other such matters; likewise, as regarding the affairs of each diocese of the patriarchs, the diocesan synod shall govern such matters of the diocese in question, as the Nicene Council has decreed (c. VI). For the same thing is involved in the decree of the Nicene Council that no bishop shall be ordained without the consent of the metropolitan, and in which the present Council says to the effect that the synod of each province (of the metropolitan, that is to say) shall govern the affairs of each province, respectively. As for the churches of God that are situated in the midst of barbarian nations, where there either were not enough bishops to make up a synod, or it was necessary for some scholarly bishop to go there in order to bolster up the Christians in their faith. These churches, I say, ought to be managed in accordance with the prevailing custom of the Fathers. To be more explicit, neighboring and abler bishops ought to go to them, in order to supply what is missing for a local synod. Which, though contrary to Canons, yet as a matter of necessity was allowed by the Council. Read Ap. cc. XXXIV and XXXV, and c. I of the Sixth.

3

Let the Bishop of Constantinople, however, have the priorities of honor after the Bishop of Rome, because of its being New Rome.

Interpretation

The preceding Canon dealt with patriarchs as a group (and especially with those of Alexandria and of Antioch), whereas the present Canon deals with the Patriarch of Constantinople specially, and says that he is to share the prerogatives of honor after the Pope and Patriarch of Rome, since Constantinople itself is also called New Rome.

The preposition after here does not denote being later in point of time, as some say in company with Aristenus, but neither does it denote any abasement and diminution, as Zonaras incorrectly interprets it (because, in view of the fact that the bishop of Alexandria is after the bishop of Constantinople, and the bishop of Antioch is after the bishop of Alexandria, and the bishop of Jerusalem is after the bishop of Antioch, according to c. XXXVI of the Sixth Ec. C., there would result four removes of honor, and consequently five different degrees of honor one higher than the other, which is contrary to all the catholic Church, and acceptable only to the Latins and the Latin-minded); but, on the contrary, it denotes equality of honor, and an order of disposition according to which one is first and another second. The fact that it denotes equality of honor is to be seen in the fact that the Fathers assembled in Chalcedon, in their c. XXVIII, assert that these 150 Bishops gave equal priorities to the Bishop of old Rome and to the Bishop of new Rome; and in the fact that the Bishops who convened in the Trullus (i.e. the First Trullan Council, herein designated the Sixth Ecumenical), in their c. XXXVI, say for the Bishop of

Constantinople to enjoy equal priorities with the Bishop of Rome. That it refers to order of disposition is to be seen in the fact that both the former and the latter in the same Canons call the Bishop of Constantinople second after the Bishop of Rome, not the second in point of honor, but the second in order of honor. For in the very nature of things it is impossible for there to be any two equal beings called first and second with respect to one another, without any order. That is why Justinian, in Novel 130 to be found in Book V of the Basilica, Title III, calls the Bishop of Rome first, and the Bishop of Constantinople second, coming in order after the one of Rome. Note that inasmuch as Zonaras, however, in interpreting the Canon, prefixed this decree of Justinian, it is evident that as for the diminution and abasement which he ascribed above to the Bishop of Constantinople with respect to the one of Rome, was ascribed only with reference to the order of honor, and not with reference to the honor in general, according to which the one precedes and the other follows both in the matter of signatures and in the matter of seats as well as in the matter of mentioning their names. Some, it is true, assert that the present Canon grants only an honor to the Bishop of Constantinople, but that later urgent need gave him also the authority to ordain the Metropolitans in Asia and Pontus and Thrace. But the Council held in Chalcedon in its letter to Leo says that he held such authority to ordain them by virtue of an ancient custom; but its c. XXVIII (i.e., of the Fourth Ec. C). merely confirmed this.[51] Read also c. XXVIII of the Fourth.

4

As concerning Maximus the Cynic, and the disturbance caused by him in Constantinople, it is hereby decreed that Maximus neither became nor is a Bishop, and that neither are those ordained by him entitled to hold any clerical rank whatsoever. Let everything connected with him or done by him be annulled.

Interpretation

The present Canon decrees that this Maximus[52] is to be regarded as never having been a bishop at all nor as being one; and any persons ordained by him to any rank whatever are to be regarded as never having been ordained at all: because all has been annulled, including the ordination conferred upon him by the Egyptians in violation of parish and contrary to canons, as well as ordinations he conferred upon others.

5

As concerning the Tome of the Westerners, we have accepted also those in Antioch who confess a single divinity of Father and of Son and of Holy Spirit.

(c. I of the 2nd; c. I of the 6th; cc. I, II of Car.)

Interpretation

This Canon is a special and particular one. For it says that, just as the Fathers of this Council accepted the Tome of the Westerners, that is to say, the definition confirming the holy Creed of the Nicene Fathers and anathematizing all those who hold beliefs contrary thereto, which definition the Western Fathers assembled at Sardica[53] adopted and promulgated, so and in like manner they accepted also the definition of the faith set forth by those assembled at Antioch.[54] Who confess one divinity of Father, and of Son, and of Holy Spirit, in the same manner, that is to say, as the Fathers who assembled in Nicaea.

6

Because many men, in a spirit of enmity and for purposes of slander being desirous to confound and subvert ecclesiastical discipline, connive to fabricate certain charges against Orthodox Bishops managing the churches, in an attempt designing nothing else but to sully the reputation of the priests and to raise disturbances among peoples who are at peace; on this account it has pleased the holy Council of the Bishops who have convened in Constantinople to decree that informers are not to be admitted without examination, nor are all men to be allowed to bring accusations against those managing the churches, nor yet are all to be excluded. But if anyone lay a personal grievance, that is, a private complaint, against a Bishop, on the ground that he has been a victim of the Bishop's greed or other unjust treatment, in the case of such accusations neither the personality nor the religion of the accuser is to be inquired into. For then the conscience of the Bishop must be clear in every respect, and the man who claims to have been wronged should receive justice whatever be his religion. But if the indictment brought against the Bishop be of an ecclesiastical nature, then the personality of the informers must be considered, in order, first of all, not to allow heretics to make charges against Orthodox Bishops in regard to ecclesiastical matters. We call heretics those who have of old been proscribed from the Church, and those who have

thereafter been anathematized by us; and in addition to these those who, though pretending to confess the sound faith, have schismatically separated and have gathered congregations in opposition to our canonical Bishops. Further, as regarding those who have previously been condemned by the Church on certain charges and have been ousted therefrom or excluded from communion, whether they belong to the clergy or to the ranks of laymen, neither shall these persons be allowed to accuse a Bishop until they have first cleared themselves of their own indictment. Likewise as regarding those who are themselves being accused from before, they are not to be permitted to accuse a Bishop, or other clergymen, until they have first proved themselves innocent of the charges placed against them. If, however, certain persons are neither heretics nor excluded from communion, nor condemned, nor previously charged with any offenses, should declare that they have an accusation of an ecclesiastical nature against a Bishop, the holy Council bids these persons to lodge their accusations before all the Bishops of the province and before them to prove the charges against the Bishop involved in the case. But if it so happen that the provincial Bishops are unable to or incompetent to decide the case against the Bishop and make the correction due, then they are to go to a greater synod of the Bishops of this diocese summoned to try this case. And they are not to lodge the accusation until they themselves have in writing agreed to incur the same penalty if in the course of the trial it be proved that they have been slandering the accused Bishop. But if anyone, scorning what has been decreed in the foregoing statements, should dare either to annoy the emperor's ears or to trouble courts of secular authorities or an ecumenical council to the affrontment of all the Bishops of the diocese, let no such person be allowed to present any information whatever, because of his having thus roundly insulted the Canons and ecclesiastical discipline.

Interpretation

What the present Canon says may be stated as follows. Since many men wishing to confound the discipline and good order of the Church inimically slander Orthodox bishops, without accomplishing any other result than that of blackening the reputations of those in holy orders and disturbing the laity, on this account it has pleased this holy Council to decree that neither all accusers of Bishops be admitted nor again that all be excluded or refused admission. But if the charges are personal ones involving only financial loss, or, more specifically speaking, if anyone accuse a Bishop by complaining that he has treated him unjustly or greedily, by depriving him perhaps of some real or personal property, in such cases the person of the accuser must not be examined into, nor his religion; but, on the contrary, no matter what may be his religious views, he must have justice done to him in any circumstances. But if his accusations are of a criminal nature, such, that is to say, as might lower his ecclesiastical standing, as, for instance, sacrilege, the performance of sacred rites outside the confines of the parish, and the like, then and in that case the accusers ought to be examined, in the first place as to whether they are heretics, mistaken in doctrine, including both those who were anathematized by the Church long ago and those who have but now recently been anathematized by us. Secondly, as to whether they are schismatics[55] or not, or, more specifically speaking, whether or not they have separated from the Church on account of any curable habits, according to c. I of Basil the Great, and contrary to the Canons, or, in other words, the catholic Bishops who have been ordained in the Orthodox manner and in accordance with the Canons, while they themselves are congregating apart by themselves. Thirdly, whether they are entirely excommunicated from the Church for some misdeeds of theirs, or have been temporarily excommunicated from the clergymen or the laymen. As for those, however, who have already been accused by others, they are not to be permitted to accuse a Bishop or other clergymen until they prove themselves innocent of the crimes imputed to them. In case, however, those bringing these ecclesiastical and criminal accusations against a bishop happen to be free from all the above enumerated defects, the holy Council commands that these persons first present their indictments of the accused bishop before the synod of all the bishops of that particular province. But if the synod of the province cannot dispose of such a case of crimes, then the accusers may carry the matter up to the greater synod of the bishops of the Diocese,[56] and have the case terminate there. Because of the fact that in Book LX of the Basilica, Title XXVI, ch. 6, it is written that whosoever turns out to be a traitor and liar in the accusations which he makes, when it comes to the matter of punishment for this crime, shall receive that punishment which the accused one would have received if he had been found guilty, the present Canon pursuant to the civil law adds that provision that the accuser is not to commence a recital of his allegations unless he first gives a written promise to accept the same sentence and punishment as a rightly and truly and justly accused bishop would have to undergo, if it be proved that he accused him unjustly and falsely. Whoever scorns these regulations and affronts all the bishops of the Diocese, and should dare to appeal his case to the Emperor,[57] or to civil courts of secular authorities, or to appeal to an ecumenical council,[58] shall be completely estopped from lodging an information, seeing that he has insulted the Sacred Canons and has violated ecclesiastical discipline.

Concord

In much the same manner c. IX of the 4th decrees that when clergymen are at variance with one another and quarreling, they are liable to Canonical penances in case they leave their Bishop and resort to civil courts. Canon XIV of Carthage, on the other hand, says that any bishop or presbyter or deacon or clergyman shall forfeit his position in case he leaves an ecclesiastical court and goes to a civil court. But, besides this, c. XII of Antioch expressly decrees that if a presbyter or

deacon deposed by his own bishop, or if a bishop deposed by a synod or council, does not resort to a greater synod or council of bishops, but, instead of doing so, annoys the emperor, he shall no longer have any right to submit an apology (i.e., enter a plea in his own defense) or any hope of restoration (sc. to his former ecclesiastical status). Canon XXXVI of Carthage excludes from communion clergymen and bishops that appeal their case to “peramatic” (a Greek word with a signification akin to “crossing” or “fording”), or what are more properly designated “hyperhorial” (a Greek word meaning about the same thing as the word extralimitary derived from the Latin, with reference to passing or going beyond the boundaries of a territory), tribunals, and not to the superiors of their own provinces. This very thing is what is decreed by c. CXXXIV of the same Council.[59] Note, however, that lower ecclesiastical judges are not penalized by the higher ones to whom the decision of a case is appealed, unless they be proved to have judged wrongly and unjustly either by way of favoring someone or because of enmity. See also Ap. c. LXXIV and c. IX of the 4th.

7

As for those heretics who betake themselves to Orthodoxy, and to the lot of the saved, we accept them in accordance with the subjoined sequence and custom; viz.: Arians, and Macedonians, and Sabbatians, and Novatians, those calling themselves Cathari (or “Puritans”), and (those calling themselves) Aristeri[60] (Note of Translator. — This designation may be based upon the Greek word aristos, meaning “best,” though as a word it signifies “lefthand.”), and the Quartodecimans (quasi “Fourteenthists,” to use the English language in this connection), otherwise known as Tetradites (though in English this term is applied to an entirely different group of heretics), and Apollinarians we accept when they offer libelli (i.e., recantations in writing) and anathematize every heresy that does not hold the same beliefs as the catholic and apostolic Church of God, and are sealed first with holy myron (more usually called “chrism” in English) on their forehead and their eyes, and nose, and mouth, and ears; and in sealing them we say: “A seal of a free gift of Holy Spirit.” As for Eunomians, however, who are baptized with a single immersion, and Montanists, who are here called Phrygians, and the Sabellians, who teach that Father and Son are the same person, and who do some other bad things, and (those belonging to) any other heresies (for there are many heretics here, especially such as come from the country of the Galatians:[61] all of them that want to adhere to Orthodoxy we are willing to accept as Greeks. Accordingly, on the first day we make (Note of Translator. — The meaning of this word here is more exactly rendered “treat as”) them Christians; on the second day, catechumens; then, on the third day, we exorcize them with the act of blowing thrice into their face and into their ears; and thus do we catechize them, and we make them tarry a while in the church and listen to the Scriptures; and then we baptize them.

(Ap. cc. XLVI, XLVII, LXVIII; cc. VIII, XIX of the 1st; c. XCV of the 6th; cc. VII, VIII of Laod.; c. LXVI of Carth.; cc. I, V, XLVII of Basil.)

Interpretation

The present Canon specifies in what way we ought to receive those coming from heresies and joining the Orthodox faith and the portion of the saved. It says that, as for Arians and Macedonians, of whom we have spoken in Canon I of the present Council, and Sabbatians[62] and Quartodecimans, otherwise known as Tetradites,[63] and Apollinarians, we will accept them after they give us libelli, or issue a written document (libellus is a Latin word, interpreted, according to Zonaras, as meaning “publication or issue”)[64] anathematizing both their own heresy as well as every other heresy that does not believe as the holy catholic and apostolic Church of God believes (just as the First Ec. C. demanded this stipulation in writing from Novatians particularly in its c. VIII), whose forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears we first seal with holy myron, saying in each seal, “a seal of a free gift of Holy Spirit.” And we will accept thus all these converts without rebaptizing them, since, according to Zonaras, in respect of holy baptism they nowise differ from us, and baptize themselves likewise as do the Orthodox. But as for Arians and Macedonians, who are manifestly heretics, the Canon accepted them without rebaptism “economically” (Note of Translator. — This term, and the corresponding noun “economy” and verb “economize,” in the peculiar idiom of the Orthodox Church can hardly be said to be translatable into genuine English; as a first approximation they may be taken as signifying something like “managing a disagreeable set of circumstances with tact and shrewdness, instead of insisting upon precision”), the primary reason being the vast multitude of such heretics then prevalent, and a second reason being that they used to baptize themselves in the same way as we do. As regards Eunomians, on the other hand, who practiced baptism with a single immersion, and the Montanists, who there in Constantinople were known as Phrygians:[65] and the Sabellians, who used to say that the Father and the Son were one and the same person, and who used to do other terrible things, and all the other heresies of heretics (a great many of whom were to be found there, and especially those who came from the country of the Galatians); as for all these persons, I say, we accept them as Greeks, or, in other words, as persons totally unbaptized; for these persons either have not been baptized at all or, though baptized, have not been baptized aright and in a strictly Orthodox manner, wherefore they are regarded as not having been baptized at all). Accordingly, on the first day (of their reception) we make them Christians, that is to say, in other words, we make them

accept all the dogmas of Christians (while they are standing) outside the Narthex of the church, the priest meantime laying his hand upon them, in accordance with c. XXXIX of the local synod or regional council held in Illiberia, a country in Spain;[66] on the second day we make them catechumens, or, in other words, we place them in the class called catechumens; on the third day we read to them the usual exorcisms, at the same time blowing three times into their face and into their ears. And thus we catechize them in regard to particular aspects of the faith, and make them stay in church a long time[67] and listen to the divine Scriptures, and then we baptize them.[68]

Canon VII of Laodicea too would have Novatians and Quartodecimans returning to Orthodoxy treated economically in exactly the same way as they are in this Canon: that is to say, with anathematization of their heresy, and with the seal of the Myron. But Phrygians returning are required by c. VIII of the same C. to be baptized. But it must be said also that c. XCV of the 6th is nothing else than a repetition of the present Canon, except that it goes on to say that Manichees, and Valentinians, and Marcionists must be baptized when they turn to Orthodoxy; but Eutychians, and Dioscorites, and Severians may be accepted after anathematizing their own heresies — as may also the Novatians, that is to say, and the rest. Canon XIX of the First Ec. C. wants all Paulianists to get baptized in any case without fail, as is also witnessed by c. XCV of the 6th. Canon XLVII of Basil says for Encratites, and Saccophori, and Apotactites (concerning whom see c. XCV of the 6th) to get baptized when they become converted. Canon V of the same saint says for us to accept those heretics who repent at the end of their life, though not to do so indiscriminately, but only after trying them out. Read also Ap. cc. XLVI and XLVII.

Notes

[38] One thing which occurred at this Council is particularly noteworthy as constituting a refutation of the imaginary prerogative of the present Popes of Rome, the claim, that is to say, that Popes have sole authority to convoke and assemble ecumenical councils. For, behold, the present ecumenical council is one which Pope Damasus neither convoked nor even attended either in person or by deputies, nor by the usual conciliar letter; yet, in spite of all this, all the Westerners concurred then and concur now in recognizing as a truly ecumenical council.

[39] Concerning each of these groups, see the Footnote to c. I of the present Council.

[40] For the Arians, as well as the Semi-Arians and Pneumatomachs, had altered the ancient glorification (or doxology) of the Holy Trinity to which the Church was accustomed. For instead of saying “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit,” they would say “Glory be to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit,” in order that, by means of the difference of prepositions, the recusants might draw a distinction of the essence, rank, and honor belonging to the thearchic persons of the coessential and equally honorable Trinity. That is why Leontius the bishop of Antioch, who made himself a eunuch, though seeing the Orthodox Christians apply a conjunction to the Son, while the Arians, on the other hand, used the preposition “through,” and the preposition with reference to the Holy Spirit, passed over both the one and the other in silence, uttering only the end, that is to say the words “and unto the ages of ages” (Page 247 of the first volume of the Conciliar Records). During the reign of Emperor Anastasius surnamed Dicorus, when Trasmund, leader of the Arian Vandals blockaded the churches of the Orthodox in Africa and banished 120 bishops to the island of Sardinia, an Arian by the name of Barbarus (but according to others the one about to be baptized was called Barbarus), wishing to baptize someone, said: “So-and-so is being baptized in the name of the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit,” when, what a miracle! the baptismal font in the meantime had become entirely dry. (Dositheus, p. 446 of the Dodecabiblus.)

[41] Led astray by the words in ch. 20 of the Book of Revelation (v. 3 to 7), where it says that Satan was shut up and bound for a thousand years, and that the righteous who participated in the first resurrection reigned together with Christ as kings for a thousand years, many men have imagined that after the second advent and common judgment take place, the righteous are to reign here on the earth as kings for a thousand years together with Christ, and thereafter to ascend to heaven; and on this account they have been called millenarians or millennialists. There have been two battalions of millenarians. For some of them used to say that during those thousand years they are to enjoy every enjoyment, and bodily pleasure; these men were followers of Cerinthus, a pupil of Simon, in the first century, and the Marcionists in the second century of the Christian era. Others said that they were not to enjoy passionate pleasures, but rather intellectual pleasures befitting rational human beings, of whom the leader was Papias the bishop of Hierapolis (in Euseb. Eccl. Hist, book 3, ch. 34) and others. Hence it is evident that Apollinaris became such a millenarian of the first battalion, as is plain from what St. Basil the Great says (letter 332), and from what the Theologian says (Discourse 51), and from what Jerome says (Book 18 on Isaiah). On this account in refutation of this heresy this Council added to the Creed of the Nicene Council that statement, which it borrowed from the sentence which the Archangel Gabriel spoke to the Virgin, viz.: “and of his kingdom there shall be no end” (Luke 1:33). As

for the thousand years referred to by St. John, they are not to come to pass after the second advent of Christ; and the kingdom of the Lord is not describable in terms of years, nor food and drink, as St. Paul said (Rom. 14:17): but, on the contrary, a thousand years are to be understood, according to those versed in theology, to mean the interval of time extending from the first advent of Christ to the second, during which Satan was bound, according to the words of the Lord, saying, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the ruler of this world be cast out" (John 12:31). The first resurrection, by contrast, took place for justification of souls through mortification of infidelity and wickedness, concerning which Christ said "He that heareth my words, and believeth in him who sent me, hath life everlasting, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life" (John 5:24); and the Apostle said "If then ye be risen with Christ . . . set your mind on the things that are above" (Col. 3:1-2). And thereafter in this interval of time the reign of the righteous with Christ took place, being their union with Him through (i.e., by means of) the Holy Spirit, and the contemplation and enjoyment of His divine illumination, respecting which the Lord said, "Some of them that stand here shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power" (Mark 9:1).

[42] It developed and completed this Creed, as Nicephorus Callistus and others say, through Gregory of Nyssa, but as Dositheus says (p. 1028 of the Dodecabiblus) by the hand of Gregory the Theologian, who in the midst of this Council thundered out and theologically set forth these things through the Holy Spirit like a heavenly outburst of thunder: "If he is indeed a God, he is no creature. For with us a creature is one of the non-Gods. If, on the other hand, he is a creature, he is not a God. For (if so) he had a beginning in time. Whatever had a beginning, was not. But that of which it may be said that it was earlier non-existent, is not properly speaking a being. But how can what is not properly speaking a being be a God? Therefore, then, he is neither a creature of the three, nor one" etc. (These words were spoken in his inaugural address.)

[43] I said that this Council anathematized every heresy that had risen during the reigns of Constantius, of Julian, and of Valens, because in spite of the fact that Constantius professed the eternity of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, yet when once lured into the argument that the word coessential (or, in Greek, homoousian) was the cause of a scandal, owing to its not being in the Bible, he relentlessly combated those who held this belief. Hence he exiled, pauperized, and scorned many men of this belief, and assembled various councils and synods in the West and East against the doctrine of coessentiality. He showered favors upon the heretics, and elevated some of them to great thrones, who ordained their own friends ecclesiastics. Julian did everything that the emperors and persecutors preceding him had failed to do. Valens not only did whatever Constantius had done, but, being an Arian, he commenced a persecution of the Church that was worse than that inflicted by the idolaters. So that Lucius the bishop of Alexandria, who shared his views, even beat the ascetics of the desert themselves, and slew, exiled, and confiscated the property of the clergy. In fact, not only these emperors, but also the other heresies, and the Greeks and Jews had a free hand in their times, while the Orthodox Christians were persecuted. These three emperors kept persecuting the Church for forty years, until there remained but some few Orthodox saints to criticize the heresies, who, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, seized the opportunity to assemble in this ecumenical council.

[44] Note that the followers of Arius subsequently to the First Nicene Council were divided into three classes, according to St. Epiphanius (Haer. 73 and 74), and some were called Anomoeans, because they said that the Son was in all respects unlike the Father. They were led by Eunomius the Gaul, the bishop of Cyzicus, who was wont to rebaptize those joining his cacodoxy with a single immersion, holding their feet up and their head down. He also pratingly asserted that there is no hell or gehenna in reality, but that fear of it is instilled as a threat; and his views were held also by Aetius. Though called Eunomians, they were also known as Eudoxians from Eudoxius, who was like-minded with Eunomius and had served as a Patriarch of Constantinople, and had ordained Eunomius bishop of Cyzicus.

[45] Others were called Semi-Arians because they entertained half the heresy engendered by Arius. They said the Son was like the Father in all respects and coessential with the Father, but they refused to admit the word coessential as above in spite of the fact that it had been in use among the ancient Fathers even before the First Ecumenical Council (see the Prolegomena to the First Council). Their leader was Basil the bishop of Ancyra. Being one of this faction of Semi-Arians, Macedonius even proceeded to wage war upon the divinity of the Holy Spirit; but the present Second Council condemned him, since his followers were called Pneumatomachs (i.e., spirit-fighters, or opponents of the spirit). A third group called the Son neither like nor unlike the Father, but took a view midway between that of the Arians and that of the Semi-Arians.

[46] Sabellius, who hailed from Lydia and had served as a bishop of Ptolemais in Pentapolis, after becoming attached to the heresy of Noetus, a Smyranean according to Theodore and Epiphanius, but an Ephesian according to Augustine, disseminated it to such an extent that those who were driveling it came to be called after him Sabellians, instead of Noetians. He asserted that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit were three names for one and the same person, and

that that person was called at times the Father, and at times the Son, and at other times the Holy Spirit according to the diversities of that person's activities and operations.

[47] Marcellus was from Ancyra. But he embraced the heresy of Sabellius, and not only called Christ a mere man, but also prated that after the second judgment the body of the Lord has to be thrown away, and to go into non-being, according to Euseb. Eccl. Hist., book 3; and that consequently His kingdom will come to an end.

[48] Photinus, who hailed from Sirmium and had served as bishop of Sirmium, entertained the same views as Paul of Samosata. For he neither recognized the Holy Trinity as a God, calling it only a Spirit creative of the universe, and declaring the Logos to be only the oral word, serving as a sort of mechanical instrument, nor did he call Christ a God, but only a mere human being who had imbibed that oral word from God and had received existence from Mary. According to Sozomenus, Eccl. Hist., book 4, ch. 6. Concerning this see also c. VII of Laodicea.

[49] Apollinaris, who became a bishop of Laodicea, Syria, embraced the heresy of Arius, who asserted among other things that the Logos (or rational faculty) served the body of Christ in lieu of a soul. According to both Athanasius and Epiphanius, at times he used to say that the Logos received a body without a soul, while at other times, being ashamed of his ignorance or want of knowledge, he would say that He received a soul, but a mindless one and an irrational one, separating, in accordance with the Platonists the soul from the mind. He even went so far as to say that we ought not to adore or worship a God-bearing human being; but, taking him up on this point, Gregory the Theologian countered that we ought to adore or worship not God-bearing flesh, but man-bearing God (see St. Gregory the Theologian's letter 2 to Cledonius). He even went on to prate that Christ possessed the flesh from ever since the time the world began (or, as the Greek idiom has it, "from the age"), because he misunderstood the phrase "the second man (came) from heaven" (1 Cor. 15:47), and consequently took it that He had received no flesh from the Virgin, as Basil attests in one of his letters.

[50] Note that although Socrates (in his book 5, ch. 8) says that the Second Council distributed the churches among the Patriarchs by the present Canon, yet Sozomen, as those interpreting Socrates, says, in regard to those whom the latter called patriarchs, that it appeared reasonable to the Council for the faith of the Nicene Fathers to be delivered to all the churches through the agency of the bishops in communion and of like mind with Nectarius of Constantinople and Timothy of Alexandria. So, then, the ones whom Socrates called patriarchs are referred to by Sozomen as those in communion, so that he said that they were improperly called patriarchs, instead of exarchs.

[51] Note that because recusant Dioscorus disregarded the present Canon and at the latrocinium (Englished Robber Council, held A.D. 449) seated the Bishop of Constantinople St. Flavian in the fifth place, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, after going away to Rome, and in the presence of clergymen of Constantinople, read this Canon to the most holy Pope of Rome Leo, who accepted it.

[52] This Maximus was an Egyptian and a Cynic philosopher by profession (they were called Cynics on account of the insolence and impudence which they had and which was like that of dogs, the name of which animals in Greek is cynes). Having gained the friendship of St. Gregory the Theologian in Constantinople, he was catechized and baptized by him, and indeed was even admitted to be enrolled in the clergy after becoming a defender of the doctrine of coessentiality (called also homoousianity). Later, however, when he plotted to get possession of the throne of Constantinople, he sent money to Peter the Bishop of Alexandria, and the latter sent some men and they ordained him Bishop of Constantinople in the house of a yokel, according to St. Gregory's pupil Gregory, who wrote his biography. But as Theodoret (Discourse 5, ch. 8) and Sozomen (book 7, ch. 9) say, after the Egyptian bishops came to Byzantium together with Timothy of Alexandria, they stole the ordination and installed Maximus as Bishop of Constantinople. But the Council, which had become aware of the imposition, deposed him and rendered void the ordinations performed by him. Since the same Maximus was discovered to be holding the beliefs of Apollinaris, he was also anathematized by the Council in addition. The Papists say, and indeed they even boast, that this Dog (i.e., Cynic) visited the Pope and upon repenting was pardoned by him. Against this Maximus St. Gregory the Theologian also wrote some verses and some prose, e.g.: "This man, I say, rent the Church asunder and filled it with disturbance and noise, turning out to be a wolf instead of a shepherd (or pastor), and readily pardoning everything to those at fault for the one object of treating the dogmas impiously. It was by this Maximus that Sisinius, the Bishop of the Novatians, together with Emperor Julian, was given lessons in philosophy." (According to Socrates, book 5, ch. 21.)

[53] The reason why this Tome was issued is in brief as follows. Because Emperors Constantius and Constans had learned that Eusebius and his party were troubling the church and that they had deposed Athanasius the Great and Paul of Constantinople, they commanded that a Council be held at Sardica, a city in Illyria, to be made up of Western as well as

Eastern Fathers. The Easterners, it is true, when going to the Council, wrote from Philippoupolis to the Westerners to deny Athanasius and Paul seats in the Council on the ground that they had been deposed; for they were enemies of the doctrine of coessentiality. But the Westerners replied to them that they had no knowledge of their being deposed or at fault. Upon learning these things, the Easterners left the Council and returned to Philippoupolis. The Westerners, though left alone, went through with the meeting of the Council and acquitted Athanasius and Paul, confirmed the faith of the Fathers set forth in Nicaea, without adding anything thereto or subtracting anything therefrom. So it is this exposition and confirmation of the faith that the present Canon calls the Tome of the Westerners alone, and not of the Easterners, because the latter had bolted.

[54] Socrates (book 2, ch. 10) relates that the adherents of Eusebius of Nicodemeia in the Council held at Antioch during the reign of Constantine, though they did not utterly condemn the faith set forth in Nicaea, in another style and other words composed a definition of faith wherein they appear to confess a single divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, which faith may be found in the work of Socrates in the same place. So it is this definition of faith that the present Canon says that the Council accepted (though this definition may have been first composed by the Eusebians insidiously with a view to gradually attracting the masses to the belief of the Arians, as Socrates himself suggests in the same place), which definition and Tome are mentioned also by Theodoret (book 5, ch. 9). For in the Conciliar letter which the present Second Council sent to the Romans mention is made of this. The letter says verbatim: “The details respecting the faith openly preached by us are such, then, as have been stated. Concerning them one may obtain a fuller understanding by consulting the Tome of Antioch made by the Council held there, and that set forth last year in Constantinople by the Ecumenical Council in which we confessed the faith more in extenso. Just as the twenty-five Canons, then, of the Antiochian Council were accepted, so too its above definition of faith has been accorded acceptance by this Second Council on the ground that it is correct (notwithstanding its having been insidiously put forth).”

[55] That is why Athanasius the Great in his apology to the Emperor says the following: “My accusers are Meletians, who ought not to be believed at all, for they are schismatics, and have become enemies of the Church, not now, but from the time of blessed Peter the martyr.” As for why the Canon called all schismatics and dissenters “heretics,” see the second footnote to c. I of St. Basil the Great.

[56] The noun “diocese” in Greek is one of many different significations, even in relation to ecclesiastical matters. For, A) it signifies the episcopate and bishopric of each bishop at any time, according to c. LXII of Carth. B) the province of a Metropolitan, according to c. XXVIII of the 4th. C) the provinces of many Metropolitans lying in one diocese, according to this c. VI of the 6th. D) the parish of each Patriarch, as it is also called in many places in the records of the councils and synods, as in those of the council held in Ephesus, “the holy Synod of the Eastern diocese.” And E) the combined parishes of two or three Patriarchs taken together, as is said in the Seventh Council: “Of John and Thomas, the legates of the Eastern Diocese, or, more specifically, of Antioch and Jerusalem.” These facts having been thus stated, the phrase “The Synod of the Diocese” is never used in the first and second senses, but in the fourth and fifth senses it has been used most especially, both of old and even down to this day being in force. As for the third sense it was in force of old in accordance with the present Conciliar Canon and in accordance with cc. IX and XXVIII of the 4th, but after the Fourth Ec. C. such a synod ceased to be operative. That is why Justinian, in ordinance 29 of the fourth Title of Book I (Photius Title IX, ch. 6), does not mention it at all, wherein concerning differences between bishops and clergymen he says: “For whether a metropolitan alone or together with his synod tries the case of a bishop or clergyman” (which is the same as saying that if the synod of a province tries a case, the Patriarch of the diocese keeps his eye on it), whatever decisions he makes are valid, as though he had tried the cases from the start. For neither can the decisions of Patriarchs be appealed.” That which the Canon here calls a “synod of the diocese” is called the exarch of the diocese in cc. IX and XXVIII of the 4th, the exarch being another dignitary than the Patriarch, as we shall state in connection with the interpretation of those Canons. Note, however, that Macarius of Ancyra misexplained this c. VI when he said that this Council calls Patriarchs exarchs of the diocese, because he mentions only the Synod of the province the Synod of the diocese, and the ecumenical Synod (i.e., Council). But in order to make the matter clearer we must state that the Synod of a Diocese was the assembly, or convention, of the metropolitans of a single diocese together with their chief the Exarch. Now, however, that this sort of Synod has fallen into desuetude, the Synod of each particular Patriarch decides all the ecclesiastical cases of the metropolitans of the diocese subject to his jurisdiction, as though this Synod had become a greater one than the synod of the diocese, since the Patriarchs received full authority to ordain their own metropolitans in the Fourth Ec. C. — an authority which they did not thitherto possess in all its fullness and completeness, according to Dositheus, page 388. By adding in the present Canon that one has no right to take a case to an ecumenical council after it has been decided by the synod of the diocese, this Council has given us to understand that an ecumenical council is the final judge of all ecclesiastical matters, and is the one to which any appeal has to be carried, concerning which see the Preface to the First Ecum. C. in the first Footnote thereto.

[57] If it be objected that Balsamon asserts that an emperor can do anything and everything, and for this reason can also grant an external (i.e., non-ecclesiastical) judge to try the case of a bishop or of any clergymen in general, and according to a legal observation can convert an ecclesiastical court into a civil court, we reply that we admit that he can do everything that is licit and right, but not, however, anything that is illicit and unjust. Because according to Chrysostom (in his discourse on the fact that sin introduced three modes of slavery) laws are authoritative to rule even the rulers themselves (Note of Translator. — The meaning of this observation is that laws have an inherent authority to overrule even the rulers ruling a country, and even though the latter be absolute monarchs.) For, according to the Apostle (sc. St. Paul), “no law is applicable to a righteous person” (1 Tim. 1:9) — (Note of Translator. — A correct translation of this passage requires almost perfect familiarity with the Greek language, which, of course, the translators of the English Versions of the Bible were far from possessing. Consequently it appears in both the King James and the Revised Versions so badly mistranslated that I have taken especial pains here to present the exact meaning of the original.) Read also the Interpretation of c. IX of the 4th in order to assure yourself that even the emperors themselves decree that ecclesiastical affairs are not to be decided by secular authorities. See also the Footnote to c. III of St. Sophia.

[58] Though Paul of Constantinople, and Athanasius together with Pope Julius did appeal to Constans and Constantius to have the Ecumenical Council convoked which is called the Sardican, to consider their case; and Chrysostom and Innocent appealed to Arcadius and Honorius to have an ecumenical council convoked to consider the case of Chrysostom, though, I say, these saints did appeal to an ecumenical council, they are not liable to the penalty of this Canon, for one thing, because, being Popes and Ecumenical Patriarchs, they had no higher court than themselves to pass judgment upon them, and, for another thing, because they made this appeal as a matter of necessity, seeing that the Eusebians who were about to judge Athanasius locally, and those about to judge Chrysostom, were manifest enemies.

[59] It is written also in the ecclesiastical edict in Book I of the Code, Title IV, No. 29, that no one is to be allowed to try a clergyman before the Patriarch in the first instance, but before his bishop. If he has a suspicion against the bishop, let him bring his case up before the metropolitan. If the latter too is open to suspicion, three superiors in point of seniority of ordination must try the case along with him on behalf of the whole synod. If even this arrangement is not satisfactory, let the case be carried up to the Patriarch, and let his judgment stand as though he had tried the case in the first instance, since decisions of Patriarchs are not subject to appeal, or, in other words, to being carried up to any other higher tribunal (in view of the fact, it is well to explain, that one Patriarch cannot become a judge in regard to the decision of another Patriarch, according to Dositheus, p. 390. Concerning which see Footnote 1 to the Prolegomena of the First Ec. C.).

[60] In the letter which was sent from Constantinople to the bishop of Antioch Martyrius, containing the whole of the present Canon verbatim and dealing with the way heretics ought to be received, it is written thus: “those calling themselves cathari and catharoteri (i.e., purer). Hence the name aristeri is found among others in the form aristi (signifying “best”).

[61] In the aforesaid letter to Martyrius it reads thus: “since there are many (heresies) here, coming especially from the country of the Galatians.”

[62] Sabbatius, according to Socrates (book 5, ch. 21), left the Jews and became a Christian, and was ordained a presbyter by Marcianus the bishop of the Novatians in Constantinople. Even after betaking himself to Christianity, however, he continued following the Jewish customs, celebrating festivals with the Jews, and celebrating even the Passover (or Easter) with them; and, moreover, according to Balsamon, observing Saturday as Sabbath after the manner of the Jews (and perhaps on this account bearing the name Sabbatius). Those following him were called Sabbatians, though they were also Novatians. These Novatians are called Aristeri, this being perhaps a corruption of the Greek word aristus, signifying “best.” They may have styled themselves thus as being “purer” than all other Christians, on the ground that they would not accept persons who had been married twice or who had lapsed during persecution, and would keep aloof from the uncleanness, or impurity, of these persons; or perhaps it was because they loathed the left hand (called aristeri in Greek) and would not receive anything with it, according to Balsamon. It is a matter of wonder, however, why the First Ecum. Council, in its Canon VIII, accepted these Novatians with a mere confession, whereas this Second Council insisted upon the seal of the Holy Myron. In an attempt to solve this perplexing question, we answer that the First Council decided to accept them on easy terms mainly and primarily as a matter of compromise and “economy” (i.e., shrewd “management”), in order to avoid making the Novatians loath to return to Orthodoxy because of their being ashamed of having to be anointed by the Orthodox like persons lacking by reason of not having received an application of myron. But, acting on a second principle, this Second Council accepted them only after they had received the seal of the myron, because, according to Theodoret, the Novatians did not anoint themselves with myron; for he says of them the following: “And to those who are baptized by them they do not offer the all-holy chrism.” That is the reason, I assure you, why the Renowned Fathers made it mandatory to anoint

those joining the body of the Church from this particular heresy, as did, that is to say, those of this Second Council, and also those of the Council held in Laodicea in their c. I.

[63] They were called Quartodecimans, or otherwise Tetradites, because they celebrated Easter not on Sunday, but on whatever day the moon happened to be fourteen days old, by fasting and keeping vigil.

[64] That is why Pope Liberius asked Macedonians for a written documentary confession, and they gave him a book in which was written the Symbol of Faith (usually called the Creed in English) of the Nicene Council, according to Socrates (book 4, ch. 11). Basil the Great, in his letter 72, says of the Arians: “If they claim to have changed their mind (in repentance), let them show a written repentance, and an anathematization of the Constantinopolitan (sc. their) faith and separation from heretics, and let them not deceive the more honest.”

[65] Montanus, who lived during the second century after Christ, appeared, according to Eusebius (book 5, ch. 15, of his historical account in reference to events in Mysia, situated in Phrygia — wherefore those under him were called Phrygians), as a false prophet energized by a demon (in this sense usually spelled “daemon” in English) and calling himself a Paraclete, and opposed the Apostolic traditions. Having as followers two women, namely, Priscilla and Maximilla, he called them prophetesses. He taught that marriages should be dissolved, and that men should abstain from foods on account of a loathing thereof. He and his followers perverted the festival of Easter. They conflated the Holy Trinity into a single person; and mixing with flour the blood of a child whom they had lanced, and making bread thereof, they employed it in their liturgy, and partook thereof. These Montanists were also known as Pepouzians, because they overpraised a village in Phrygia named Pepouza, which they even called Jerusalem.

[66] For it was in this manner too that c. VIII of the First accepted the Novatians, by an imposition of the hand. This local synod, or regional council, was held in Illiberia a short while before the First Ec. C. But it may also be said that all heretics and schismatics returning to the catholic Church ought to be accepted only after an imposition of the hand.

[67] As for how long a time is required for catechization see Footnote 1 to c. II of the First Ec. C.

[68] Inevitably, indispensably, and by every necessity this Canon also baptizes the Latins too as having been baptized with no immersion at all. For if it does so in the case of those who have been baptized with only a single immersion how can it be said not to do so in the case of those who have been baptized with none at all? Sufficient has been said and proved in regard to these persons in the Interpretation of Ap. c. XLVI; and what was said there is applicable here. Yet it is not amiss to add here by way of repleteness of discussion the good conclusion in fine that just as this Council decrees that Novatians returning to the fold must be myroned (i.e., anointed with genuine myron) because they were hitherto unmyroned (i.e., unanointed), so too does the Council of the Easterners baptize Latins returning to the fold, for the good and sufficient reason that they are unbaptized. See also the last Footnote to c. XCV of the Sixth Ec. C., in order to realize that Latins ought to ask to be baptized of their own accord, and not wait to be urged to do so by others.

